	Case 2:07-cv-01460-PMP-GWF Docum	nent 25 Filed 01/25/08 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9	3700 ASSOCIATES, LLC,)
10	Plaintiff,) Case No. 2:07-cv-01460-PMP-GWF
11	VS.	FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS
12	INTER WIRES, INC.,	
13	Defendant.	
14)
15	This matter is before the Court on the failure of Defendant Inter Wires, Inc. to retain counsel	
16	pursuant to Order (#24) filed on January 8, 2008.	
17	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	
18	In the Court's Order #24, the Court stated that Defendant, a corporation, is required to be	
19	represented by counsel and that its Answer was subject to being stricken and its default entered if it	
20	failed to timely retain counsel to represent it in this action. In its Order, the Court gave Defendant ten	
21	(10) days from the entry of the order, i.e., until January 18, 2008, to retain counsel. The Order further	
22	stated that if Defendant failed to comply with the Order, a recommendation would be made that	
23	Defendant's Answer be stricken and its default entered. Defendant has failed to comply with the	
24	Court's order. Accordingly,	
25	RECOMMENDATION	
26	IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Defendant's Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint (#13) be	
27	stricken, default entered, and that Plaintiff be authorized to apply for entry of a default judgment against	
28	the Defendant.	

NOTICE Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Finding and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten (10) days. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). DATED this 25th day of January, 2008. TATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE